

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully supplement their prior response of June 12, 2007.

In the prior response of June 12, independent claim 1 was amended to recite that (1) the polymer core is polyester or polyamide and (2) that the cord has an elongation at break of at least 5%. It is believed that feature (1) is adequate to distinguish over the prior art for at least the following reasons.

By virtue of reciting that the core is a polymer core of polyester or polyamide, the claim requires that the core be relatively soft with relatively low strength. In contrast, Russell expressly teaches against the claimed core. For example in the first paragraph of the Background of the Invention, Russell discusses a “core of synthetic polyester fibers” but states in connection with these cores that “such cores reduce the strength of the cord reinforcement, since the cores are simply not capable of carrying the loads that the steel strands are able to carry.” In the last sentence of this paragraph, Russell expressly states that it is an object of the Russell invention “to provide a steel cord reinforcement with a load carrying core which does not detract appreciably from the overall strength of the reinforcement.” Again in the third full paragraph of column 2, Russell states that “attempts to use cores of other synthetic fibers, such as polyester, have proven unsuccessful.”


As stated in MPEP § 2143.01 V and VI: “If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. . . . If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.”

The cited prior art clearly teaches away from feature (1), and it is thus respectfully submitted that the claims as they now stand are patentable over the cited prior art.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a
telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By  _____

Date: August 3, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,371